arXiv:1405.5952v1 [math.DG] 23 May 2014

A SPHERICAL BERNSTEIN THEOREM FOR MINIMAL SUBMANIFOLDS OF HIGHER CODIMENSION

J. JOST, Y. L. XIN AND LING YANG

Abstract. Combining the tools of geometric analysis with properties of Jordan angles and angle space distributions, we derive a spherical and a Euclidean Bernstein theorem for minimal submanifolds of arbitrary dimension and codimension, under the condition that the Gauss image is contained in some geometrically defined closed region of a Grassmannian manifold. The proof depends on the subharmoncity of an auxiliary function, the Codazzi equations and geometric measure theory.

1. Introduction

This paper is a part of our systematic approach to the Bernstein problem in higher codimension. The Bernstein problem has a spherical and a Euclidean version, and the two are tightly related and essentially equivalent, as is well known and as we shall explain in a moment in more detail.

The Euclidean version says that a complete n-dimensional minimal submanifold M of $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$, that is, of codimension m, has to be an affine subspace if its Gauss image is contained in a sufficiently small subset of the Grassmann manifold $\mathbf{G}_{m,n}$. Equivalently, it is affine when all of its normal spaces N satisfies $\langle N, Q_0\rangle > c_0$ for a fixed reference space Q_0 and some positive constant c_0. In either formulation, we are assuming that the tangent, or equivalently, the normal spaces do not change their direction too much when we move across M. That some such condition is necessary follows from an example of Lawson-Osserman[14] with $\langle N, Q_0\rangle = 1/9$. And that example tells us, more precisely, that the condition has to be stricter for $m > 1$ than in the codimension 1 case, the setting of the classical Bernstein theorem [3] and its extensions by Fleming [7], de Giorgi [5], Almgren [2], Simons [17], Moser [15], and others.

The spherical Bernstein theorem concerns compact $(n-1)$-dimensional minimal submanifolds of the sphere S^{n+m-1}, and analogously, the aim is to prove that they are totally geodesic (i.e. equatorial) subspheres when their normal planes do not change their directions too much.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 58E20,53A10.

The first author is supported by the ERC Advanced Grant FP7-267087. The second named author and the third named author are partially supported by NSFC. They are grateful to the Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences in Leipzig for its hospitality and continuous support.

As indicated, we are interested here in the case $m > 1$, and we ask what the optimal quantitative condition is. In previous work, we have shown

Theorem 1.1. [11] *Let M be an $(n-1)$-dimensional compact minimal submanifold in S^{n+m-1}. Suppose that there is a fixed oriented m-plane Q_0 and a number $c_0 > 1/3$, such that $\langle N, Q_0\rangle \geq c_0$ holds for all normal m-planes N of M. Then M is totally geodesic.*

Our question here is whether this is optimal, that is, whether there exists a counterexample for $c_0 = 1/3$, or whether one can move beyond. In this paper, we show that the result continues to hold for $c_0 = 1/3$, that is,

Theorem 1.2. *Let M be an $(n-1)$-dimensional compact minimal submanifold in S^{n+m-1}. Suppose that there is a fixed oriented m-plane Q_0, such that $\langle N, Q_0\rangle \geq 1/3$ holds for all normal m-planes N of M. Then M is totally geodesic.*

This might look like a small and insignificant step, but as in many examples of geometric analysis, limiting cases often are much harder than those involving strict inequalities. The reason is that one needs additional tools to analyze possible limit configurations before one can deduce that they can't exist after all. Typically, in such cases, the analytical estimates need to be supplemented by considerations of a more algebraic nature. That is also the case here. We shall carefully utilize the information contained in the Codazzi equations. Still, there exists a quantitative gap between the above positive results and the counterexample of Lawson-Osserman, as the latter corresponds to the value $c_0 = 1/9$ instead of the $1/3$ that we can currently achieve. Nevertheless, we believe that since we can now rule out a counterexample for $c_0 = 1/3$, we expect that one can go even beyond that value. Whether $c_0 = 1/9$ is the largest value with a counterexample or whether a counterexample different from the Lawson-Osserman one exists for some value between $1/9$ and $1/3$, we currently do not know.

Let us now recall the relation between the spherical and the Euclidean Bernstein problem and then state our results for the latter. Fleming's idea [7] was that by rescaling a nontrivial minimal graph in Euclidean space, one obtains a nonflat minimal cone, and the intersection of that cone with the unit sphere then is a compact minimal submanifold of the latter. Therefore, conditions ruling out the latter can be translated into conditions ruling out the former. Because of the noncompact nature of minimal graphs in Euclidean space, as an important technical ingredient, one needs to invoke Allard's regularity theory.

We then obtain the following result concerning the Euclidean version of the higher codimensional Bernstein problem (see Theorem 4.2), which is an improvement of Theorem 1.1 in [11].

Theorem 1.3. *Let $f := (f^1, \cdots, f^m)$ be a smooth $\mathbb{R}^m$-valued function defined everywhere on $\mathbb{R}^n$. If its graph $M :=$ graph $f = \{(x, f(x)) : x \in \mathbb{R}^m\}$ is a minimal submanifold in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$, and*

$$\Delta_f := \Big[\det\Big(\delta_{ij} + \sum_\alpha \frac{\partial f^\alpha}{\partial x^i}\frac{\partial f^\alpha}{\partial x^j}\Big)\Big]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq 3, \tag{1.1}$$

then $f^1, \cdots, f^m$ have to be affine linear, that is, represent an affine n-plane in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$.

The 3 here corresponds to the 1/3 in the preceding results as will become clear below when we describe the geometry.

In geometric terms, we approach the Bernstein problem via the normal Gauss map γ of a minimal submanifold M which takes values in the Grassmannian manifold $\mathbf{G}_{m,n}$. The strategy which was first applied in [9] then is to show that γ is constant. This, of course, is equivalent to M being affine. The main point here is that this Gauss map is harmonic. Therefore, the strategy then leads to showing that under appropriate geometric conditions, a harmonic map into a Grassmannian $\mathbf{G}_{m,n}$ has to be constant. This strategy could be successfully applied in increasing generality, in [9, 10, 11, 12]. Essentially, one tries to translate a geometric restriction on the size of the Gauss image $\gamma(M)$ into the subharmonicity of a composition function $\phi \circ \gamma$ where $\phi : \gamma(M) \to \mathbb{R}$ is a suitable scalar function, for instance a strictly convex function. When we are in the spherical setting, the domain M is compact, and so, such a subharmonic function $\phi \circ \gamma$ then has to be constant by the maximum principle. One then utilizes this to deduce that γ is constant itself. In the Euclidean setting, $\phi \circ \gamma$ has to be subjected to clever and subtle estimates to eventually reach the same conclusion. As already mentioned, for the case $c_0 = 1/3$ which we are treating in the present paper, this strategy by itself is not yet powerful enough and needs to be supplemented by detailed algebraic considerations. In more precise terms, we consider eigenspaces for Jordan angles between the tangent or normal space of our minimal submanifold M and some fixed reference space. Invoking a theorem of Nomizu [16], we find that, generically, they yield smooth subbundles of the tangent or normal bundle of M. This will provide us with decompositions that can be algebraically exploited.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the basic geometric concepts on Grassmannian manifolds, those of Jordan angles, angle spaces, multiplicities, anti-involutive automorphisms and angle space distributions, are introduced, which will play an important role in our statement, and the connection between the w-function on Grassmannian manifolds and the Jordan angles is revealed. Let Q_0 be a fixed point on $\mathbf{G}_{m,n}$, then the composition of $w(\cdot, Q_0)$ and the normal Gauss map yields a smooth function on M, an arbitrary submanifold in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$, which is called the w-function. Based on [6], [11] and the properties of Jordan angles, one can prove $v := w^{-1}$ is a subharmonic function whenever M has parallel mean curvature and $v \leq 3$. We also explore the second fundamental form of M provided that $v \leq 3$, $\Delta v \equiv 0$ and $|B|^2 \neq 0$ everywhere, and discover that M is a simple austere submanfold, a notion introduced by Harvey-Lawson [8] and further studied by Bryant [4]. These are the main points of Section 3. Finally in Section 4, combining the Codazzi equations and basic properties of angle spaces, we derive a spherical Bernstein theorem, and also the corresponding Euclidean Bernstein theorem.

2. Jordan angles and angle space distributions

Let $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ be an $(n+m)$-dimensional Euclidean space. The oriented m-spaces in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ constitute the Grassmann manifold $\mathbf{G}_{m,n}$, which is the Riemannian symmetric space of compact type $SO(n+m)/SO(n)\times SO(m)$.

Let P, Q_0 be 2 points in $\mathbf{G}_{m,n}$. The *Jordan angles* between P and Q_0 are the critical values of the angle θ between a nonzero vector u in P and its orthogonal projection u^* in Q_0 as u runs through P. If θ is a nonzero Jordan angle between P and Q_0 determined by a unit vector u in P and its projection u^* in Q_0, then u is called an *angle direction* of P relative to Q_0, and the 2-plane spanned by u and u^* is called an *angle 2-plane* between P and Q_0 (see [18]).

Now, we give a slightly different description for the Jordan angles, which will be useful later.

Denote by $\mathcal{P}_0$ the orthogonal projection of $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ onto Q_0 and by $\mathcal{P}$ the orthogonal projection of $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ onto P. Then for an arbitrary vector $u\in P$ and $\varepsilon\in Q_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathcal{P}_0 u,\varepsilon\rangle &= \langle \mathcal{P}_0 u+(u-\mathcal{P}_0 u),\varepsilon\rangle = \langle u,\varepsilon\rangle\\ &= \langle u,\mathcal{P}\varepsilon+(\varepsilon-\mathcal{P}\varepsilon)\rangle = \langle u,\mathcal{P}\varepsilon\rangle.\end{aligned}\tag{2.1}$$

This means that $\mathcal{P}$ is adjoint to $\mathcal{P}_0$ with respect to the canonical Euclidean inner product. Moreover,

$$\langle (\mathcal{P}\circ\mathcal{P}_0)u,v\rangle = \langle \mathcal{P}_0 u,\mathcal{P}_0 v\rangle = \langle u,(\mathcal{P}\circ\mathcal{P}_0)v\rangle\tag{2.2}$$

holds for any $u,v\in P$, which implies that $\mathcal{P}\circ\mathcal{P}_0$ is a nonnegative definite self-adjoint transformation on P.

For every nonzero $u\in P$,

$$\cos^2\angle(u,u^*) = \frac{\langle u^*,u^*\rangle}{\langle u,u\rangle} = \frac{\langle \mathcal{P}_0 u,\mathcal{P}_0 u\rangle}{\langle u,u\rangle} = \frac{\langle (\mathcal{P}\circ\mathcal{P}_0)u,u\rangle}{\langle u,u\rangle}.\tag{2.3}$$

Hence θ is a Jordan angle between P and Q_0 if and only if $\mu := \cos^2\theta$ is an eigenvalue of $\mathcal{P}\circ\mathcal{P}_0$, and u is an angle direction associated to θ if and only if it is an eigenvector associated to the eigenvalue μ, i.e.

$$(\mathcal{P}\circ\mathcal{P}_0)u = \mu u = \cos^2\theta\ u.\tag{2.4}$$

Therefore, all the angle directions associated to θ constitute a linear subspace of P, which is called an *angle space* of P relative to Q_0 and we denote it by P_θ. The dimension of P_θ is called the *multiplicity* of θ, which is denoted by m_θ. If we denote by $\mathrm{Arg}(P,Q_0)$ the set consisting of all the Jordan angles between P and Q_0, then

$$P = \bigoplus_{\theta\in \mathrm{Arg}(P,Q_0)} P_\theta.\tag{2.5}$$

and hence

$$m = \sum_{\theta\in \mathrm{Arg}(P,Q_0)} m_\theta.\tag{2.6}$$

The angle spaces are mutually orthogonal to each other, and in particular

$$P_0 = P \cap Q_0, \qquad P_{\pi/2} = P \cap Q_0^\perp. \tag{2.7}$$

Similarly, θ is a Jordan angle between Q_0 and P if and only if $\mu := \cos^2\theta$ is an eigenvalue of $\mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{P}$. Denote by $(Q_0)_\theta$ the angle space of Q_0 relative to P associated to θ, then $\varepsilon \in (Q_0)_\theta$ if and only if $(\mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{P})\varepsilon = \cos^2\theta\ \varepsilon$, and

$$Q_0 = \bigoplus_{\theta \in \mathrm{Arg}(Q_0, P)} (Q_0)_\theta \tag{2.8}$$

with $\mathrm{Arg}(Q_0, P)$ denoting the set consisting of all the Jordan angles between Q_0 and P.

Let $P^\perp$ and $Q_0^\perp$ be the orthogonal complements of P and Q_0, and denote by $\mathcal{P}_0^\perp$ and $\mathcal{P}^\perp$ the orthogonal projections of $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ onto $P^\perp$ and $Q_0^\perp$, respectively. As above, the set consisting of all the Jordan angles between $P^\perp$ and $Q_0^\perp$ is denoted by $\mathrm{Arg}(P^\perp, Q_0^\perp)$, $P_\theta^\perp$ denotes the angle space associated to $\theta \in \mathrm{Arg}(P^\perp, Q_0^\perp)$, and $m_\theta^\perp := \dim P_\theta^\perp$ denotes the multiplicity of θ. The following lemma reveals the close relationship between $\mathrm{Arg}(P, Q_0)$, $\mathrm{Arg}(Q_0, P)$ and $\mathrm{Arg}(P^\perp, Q_0^\perp)$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $P, Q_0 \in \mathbf{G}_{m,n}$, then $Arg(P, Q_0) = Arg(Q_0, P)$ and the multiplicities of each corresponding Jordan angles are equivalent. If we denote*

$$R_\theta := P_\theta + (Q_0)_\theta \tag{2.9}$$

for each $\theta \in Arg(P, Q_0)$, then $R_\theta \perp R_\sigma$ whenever $\theta \neq \sigma$, and

$$P + Q_0 = \bigoplus_{\theta \in Arg(P, Q_0)} R_\theta. \tag{2.10}$$

For any $\theta \in (0, \pi/2]$, $\theta \in Arg(P^\perp, Q_0^\perp)$ if and only if $\theta \in Arg(P, Q)$, and $m_\theta^\perp = m_\theta$, $R_\theta = P_\theta \oplus P_\theta^\perp$. Moreover, for every $\theta \in Arg(P, Q_0) \cap (0, \pi/2)$, there exists $\Phi_\theta : R_\theta \to R_\theta$, satisfying

(i) $|\Phi_\theta(\xi)| = |\xi|$ for every $\xi \in R_\theta$;

(ii) $\Phi_\theta^2 = -\mathbf{Id}$;

(iii) $\Phi_\theta(P_\theta) = P_\theta^\perp$, $\Phi_\theta(P_\theta^\perp) = P_\theta$;

(iv) For any nonzero vector $u \in P_\theta$ ($v \in P_\theta^\perp$), $\Phi_\theta(u)$ ($\Phi_\theta(v)$) lies in the angle 2-plane generated by u (v); more precisely,

$$\begin{aligned} \sec\theta\ \mathcal{P}_0 u &= \cos\theta\ u - \sin\theta\ \Phi_\theta(u), \\ \sec\theta\ \mathcal{P}_0^\perp v &= \cos\theta\ v - \sin\theta\ \Phi_\theta(v). \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

*Φ_θ is called the **anti-involutive automorphism** associated to θ.*

Proof. Given any $\theta \in \mathrm{Arg}(P, Q_0) \cap [0, \pi/2)$ and $u \in P_\theta$, letting $\varepsilon := \mathcal{P}_0 u$ gives

$$(\mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{P})\varepsilon = (\mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{P}_0)u = \cos^2\theta\ \mathcal{P}_0 u = \cos^2\theta\ \varepsilon. \tag{2.12}$$

Hence $\theta \in \mathrm{Arg}(Q_0, P)$ and $\mathcal{P}_0$ is an injective linear mapping from P_θ into $(Q_0)_\theta$. On the other hand, assuming $\theta \in \mathrm{Arg}(Q_0, P) \cap [0, \pi/2)$, one can deduce $\theta \in \mathrm{Arg}(P, Q_0)$ and $\mathcal{P}$ is an injective linear mapping from $(Q_0)_\theta$ into P_θ. Thus both $\mathcal{P}_0$ and $\mathcal{P}$ are linear isomorphisms whenever $\theta \in [0, \pi/2)$, and then $\dim(Q_0)_\theta = \dim P_\theta$. In conjunction with (2.5) and (2.8),

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(Q_0)_{\pi/2} &= m - \sum_{\theta \in \mathrm{Arg}(Q_0,P)\cap[0,\pi/2)} \dim(Q_0)_\theta \\ &= m - \sum_{\theta \in \mathrm{Arg}(P,Q_0)\cap[0,\pi/2)} \dim P_\theta \\ &= \dim P_{\pi/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

This mean $\pi/2 \in \mathrm{Arg}(Q_0, P)$ if and only if $\pi/2 \in \mathrm{Arg}(P, Q_0)$ and the multiplicities are equivalent. Therefore, $\mathrm{Arg}(Q_0, P) = \mathrm{Arg}(P, Q_0)$ and $\dim(Q_0)_\theta = \dim P_\theta = m_\theta$ for every $\theta \in \mathrm{Arg}(P, Q_0)$.

Let θ, σ be distinct Jordan angles between P and Q_0, it has been shown above that $P_\theta \perp P_\sigma$ and $(Q_0)_\theta \perp (Q_0)_\sigma$. For any $u \in P_\theta$ and $\varepsilon \in (Q_0)_\sigma$,

$$\langle u, \varepsilon \rangle = \langle u, \mathcal{P}(\varepsilon) \rangle \in \langle P_\theta, P_\sigma \rangle = (0),$$

which implies $P_\theta \perp (Q_0)_\sigma$ and similarly $(Q_0)_\theta \perp P_\sigma$. Hence $R_\theta \perp R_\sigma$ and then (2.10) immediately follows from (2.5) and (2.8).

If $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$ is a Jordan angle between P and Q_0, then for any nonzero vector $u \in P_\theta$, we have $|\mathcal{P}_0 u| = \cos\theta |u|$ and $(\mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{P}_0)u = \cos^2\theta \; u$. Denote

$$\varepsilon := \sec\theta \; \mathcal{P}_0 u, \tag{2.14}$$

then $|\varepsilon| = |u|$. Now we put

$$v := -\sec\theta \csc\theta (\mathcal{P}^\perp \circ \mathcal{P}_0)u \in P^\perp, \tag{2.15}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon = \sec\theta \; \mathcal{P}_0 u &= \sec\theta \big[(\mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{P}_0)u + (\mathcal{P}^\perp \circ \mathcal{P}_0)u \big] \\ &= \cos\theta \; u - \sin\theta \; v \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

which implies $v \in \mathrm{span}\{u, \mathcal{P}_0 u\} \subset R_\theta$ and $|v| = |u|$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{P}^\perp \circ \mathcal{P}_0^\perp)v &= -\sec\theta \csc\theta (\mathcal{P}^\perp \circ \mathcal{P}_0^\perp \circ (\mathbf{Id} - \mathcal{P}) \circ \mathcal{P}_0)u \\ &= \sec\theta \csc\theta (\mathcal{P}^\perp \circ (\mathbf{Id} - \mathcal{P}_0) \circ \mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{P}_0)u \\ &= \cot\theta (\mathcal{P}^\perp \circ (\mathbf{Id} - \mathcal{P}_0))u \\ &= -\cot\theta (\mathcal{P}^\perp \circ \mathcal{P}_0)u = \cos^2\theta \; v, \end{aligned}$$

$\theta \in \mathrm{Arg}(P^\perp, Q_0^\perp)$, $v \in P_\theta^\perp$ and

$$\Phi_{1,\theta} : u \mapsto -\sec\theta \csc\theta (\mathcal{P}^\perp \circ \mathcal{P}_0)u \tag{2.17}$$

is injective from P_θ into $P_\theta^\perp$, which implies $m_\theta^\perp \geq m_\theta$. (2.16) then becomes

$$\sec\theta \; \mathcal{P}_0 u = \cos\theta \; u - \sin\theta \; \Phi_{1,\theta}(u). \tag{2.18}$$

Similarly, if $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$ is a Jordan angle between $P^\perp$ and $Q_0^\perp$, then $\theta \in \mathrm{Arg}(P, Q_0)$ and

$$\Phi_{2,\theta} : v \mapsto -\sec\theta \csc\theta (\mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{P}_0^\perp) v \tag{2.19}$$

is also injective from $P_\theta^\perp$ into P_θ, which implies

$$\sec\theta\ \mathcal{P}_0^\perp v = \cos\theta\ v - \sin\theta\ \Phi_{2,\theta}(v) \tag{2.20}$$

and $m_\theta \geq m_\theta^\perp$. Therefore $m_\theta = m_\theta^\perp$, and both $\Phi_{1,\theta}$ and $\Phi_{2,\theta}$ are isomorphisms.

For any $\theta \in \mathrm{Arg}(P, Q_0) \cap (0, \pi/2)$, $P_\theta^\perp = \Phi_{1,\theta}(P_\theta) \subset R_\theta$ gives $P_\theta \oplus P_\theta^\perp \subset R_\theta$. On the other hand, $P_\theta \cap (Q_0)_\theta \subset (P \cap Q_0) \cap P_\theta = P_0 \cap P_\theta = (0)$ implies $\dim R_\theta = \dim P_\theta + \dim (Q_0)_\theta = 2m_\theta = \dim P_\theta + \dim P_\theta^\perp$, then $R_\theta = P_\theta \oplus P_\theta^\perp$. Now we define $\Phi_\theta : R_\theta \to R_\theta$

$$u + v \mapsto \Phi_{1,\theta}(u) + \Phi_{2,\theta}(v) \qquad \forall u \in P_\theta, v \in P_\theta^\perp. \tag{2.21}$$

Then Φ_θ is an isometric automorphism, $\Phi_\theta(P_\theta) = P_\theta^\perp$, $\Phi_\theta(P_\theta^\perp) = P_\theta$ and (2.11) immediately follows from (2.18) and (2.20). For any $u \in P_\theta$, (2.17) and (2.19) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_\theta^2(u) &= \sec^2\theta \csc^2\theta (\mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{P}_0^\perp \circ \mathcal{P}^\perp \circ \mathcal{P}_0) u \\
&= \sec^2\theta \csc^2\theta (\mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{P}_0^\perp \circ (\mathbf{Id} - \mathcal{P}) \circ \mathcal{P}_0) u \\
&= -\sec^2\theta \csc^2\theta (\mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{P}_0^\perp \circ \mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{P}_0) u \\
&= -\csc^2\theta (\mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{P}_0^\perp) u = \csc^2\theta (\mathcal{P} \circ (\mathbf{Id} - \mathcal{P}_0) u) \\
&= -u
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly $\Phi_\theta^2(v) = -v$ for each $v \in P_\theta^\perp$. Hence $\Phi_\theta^2 = -\mathbf{Id}$.

It remains to prove $m_{\pi/2} = m_{\pi/2}^\perp$. By (2.13),

$$\begin{aligned}
m_{\pi/2}^\perp &= \dim P_{\pi/2}^\perp = \dim (P^\perp \cap Q_0) \\
&= \dim (Q_0)_{\pi/2} = \dim P_{\pi/2} \\
&= m_{\pi/2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

□

Denote

$$r := \sum_{\theta \in \mathrm{Arg}(P,Q_0) \cap (0,\pi/2]} m_\theta = \sum_{\theta \in \mathrm{Arg}(P^\perp, Q_0^\perp) \cap (0,\pi/2]} m_\theta^\perp \tag{2.23}$$

then $0 \in \mathrm{Arg}(P, Q_0)$ if and only if $r < m$, and $m_0 = m - r$. Similarly $0 \in \mathrm{Arg}(P^\perp, Q_0^\perp)$ if and only if $r < n$, and $m_0^\perp = n - r$.

It is well-known that $\mathbf{G}_{m,n}$ can be viewed as a submanifold of some Euclidean space via the Plücker embedding. The restriction of the Euclidean inner product on $\mathbf{G}_{m,n}$ is denoted by $w : \mathbf{G}_{m,n} \times \mathbf{G}_{m,n} \to \mathbb{R}$. Let $\{\varepsilon_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_m\}$ and $\{u_1, \cdots, u_m\}$

denote oriented orthonormal bases of Q_0 and P, respectively, then

$$\begin{aligned} w(P,Q_0) &= \langle u_1\wedge\cdots\wedge u_m, \varepsilon_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\varepsilon_m\rangle \\ &= \begin{vmatrix} \langle u_1,\varepsilon_1\rangle & \cdots & \langle u_1,\varepsilon_m\rangle \\ & \cdots & \\ \langle u_m,\varepsilon_1\rangle & \cdots & \langle u_m,\varepsilon_m\rangle \end{vmatrix} \\ &= \begin{vmatrix} \langle \mathcal{P}_0u_1,\varepsilon_1\rangle & \cdots & \langle \mathcal{P}_0u_1,\varepsilon_m\rangle \\ & \cdots & \\ \langle \mathcal{P}_0u_m,\varepsilon_1\rangle & \cdots & \langle \mathcal{P}_0u_m,\varepsilon_m\rangle \end{vmatrix} \\ &= \langle \mathcal{P}_0u_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\mathcal{P}_0u_m, \varepsilon_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\varepsilon_m\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

Note that the definition of $w(P,Q_0)$ does not depend on the choices of oriented orthonormal bases of P and Q_0.

As shown above, one can choose an orthonormal basis $\{u_1,\cdots,u_m\}$ of P, such that $P = u_1\wedge\cdots\wedge u_m$, and each u_α is an angle direction of P relative to Q_0. More precisely,

$$(\mathcal{P}\circ\mathcal{P}_0)u_\alpha = \cos^2\theta_\alpha u_\alpha, \tag{2.25}$$

where θ_α is a Jordan angle between P and Q_0. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{P}_0u_\alpha, \mathcal{P}_0u_\beta\rangle &= \langle \mathcal{P}_0u_\alpha, u_\beta\rangle = \langle (\mathcal{P}\circ\mathcal{P}_0)u_\alpha, u_\beta\rangle \\ &= \cos^2\theta_\alpha\langle u_\alpha,u_\beta\rangle = \cos^2\theta_\alpha\delta_{\alpha\beta}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

If $\pi/2\in \mathrm{Arg}(P,Q_0)$, then there exists α, such that $\theta_\alpha = \pi/2$, which implies $\mathcal{P}_0u_\alpha = 0$, and moreover

$$w(P,Q_0) = \langle \mathcal{P}_0u_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\mathcal{P}_0u_m, \varepsilon_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\varepsilon_m\rangle = 0. \tag{2.27}$$

Otherwise, by (2.26), $\{\varepsilon'_\alpha = \frac{\mathcal{P}_0u_\alpha}{|\mathcal{P}_0u_\alpha|} = \sec\theta_\alpha(\mathcal{P}_0u_\alpha) : 1\le\alpha\le m\}$ is an orthonormal basis of Q_0, thus $Q_0 = \varepsilon'_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\varepsilon'_m$ or $-\varepsilon'_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\varepsilon'_m$. If $Q_0 = \varepsilon'_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\varepsilon'_m$, then

$$\begin{aligned} w(P,Q_0) &= \langle \mathcal{P}_0u_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\mathcal{P}_0u_m, \varepsilon'_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\varepsilon'_m\rangle \\ &= \langle \cos\theta_1\varepsilon'_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\cos\theta_m\varepsilon'_m, \varepsilon'_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\varepsilon'_m\rangle \\ &= \prod_\alpha \cos\theta_\alpha\langle \varepsilon'_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\varepsilon'_m, \varepsilon'_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\varepsilon'_m\rangle = \prod_\alpha\cos\theta_\alpha; \end{aligned} \tag{2.28}$$

otherwise $Q_0 = -\varepsilon'_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\varepsilon'_m$ and a similar calculation shows

$$w(P,Q_0) = -\prod_\alpha\cos\theta_\alpha. \tag{2.29}$$

In summary,

$$|w(P,Q_0)| = \prod_\alpha\cos\theta_\alpha \tag{2.30}$$

and $w(P,Q_0)>0$ if and only if $\mathcal{P}_0|_P$ is an orientation preserving map from P onto Q_0.

Lemma 2.2. *If $w(P,Q_0)>0$, let*

$$\pi/2>\theta_1\geq\cdots\geq\theta_r>\theta_{r+1}=\cdots=\theta_m=0$$

be the Jordan angles between P and Q_0, then there exist an orthonormal basis $\{\varepsilon_1,\cdots,\varepsilon_m\}$ of Q_0, an orthonormal basis $\{u_1,\cdots,u_m\}$ of P and an orthonormal basis $\{v_1,\cdots,v_n\}$ of $P^\perp$, such that $Q_0=\varepsilon_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\varepsilon_m$, $P=u_1\wedge\cdots\wedge u_m$, $\mathcal{P}_0u_\alpha=\cos\theta_\alpha\varepsilon_\alpha$ for each $1\leq\alpha\leq m$ and $\mathcal{P}_0v_i=-\sin\theta_i\varepsilon_i$ for each $1\leq i\leq n$. Here we additionally assume $\theta_i:=0$ and $\varepsilon_i:=0$ for any $m+1\leq i\leq n$. In particular, for each $1\leq\alpha\leq r$, $v_\alpha=\Phi_{\theta_\alpha}(u_\alpha)$, with Φ_{θ_α} denoting the anti-involutive automorphism associated to θ_α.

Proof. Let $\{u_1,\cdots,u_m\}$ be an orthonormal basis of P, such that $P=u_1\wedge\cdots\wedge u_m$ and $(\mathcal{P}\circ\mathcal{P}_0)u_\alpha=\cos^2\theta_\alpha u_\alpha$. Putting

$$\varepsilon_\alpha:=\frac{\mathcal{P}_0u_\alpha}{|\mathcal{P}_0u_\alpha|}=\sec\theta_\alpha(\mathcal{P}_0u_\alpha)\in Q_0\qquad\forall 1\leq\alpha\leq m, \tag{2.31}$$

then (2.26) gives $\langle\varepsilon_\alpha,\varepsilon_\beta\rangle=\delta_{\alpha\beta}$ and hence $\{\varepsilon_1,\cdots,\varepsilon_m\}$ is an orthonormal basis of Q_0. $w(P,Q_0)>0$ implies that $\mathcal{P}_0|_P$ is an orientation preserving map, thus $Q_0=\varepsilon_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\varepsilon_m$.

For each $1\leq\alpha\leq r$, let $v_\alpha:=\Phi_{\theta_\alpha}(u_\alpha)$. By Lemma 2.1,

$$\varepsilon_\alpha=\sec\theta_\alpha(\mathcal{P}_0u_\alpha)=\cos\theta_\alpha u_\alpha-\sin\theta_\alpha v_\alpha \tag{2.32}$$

and

$$\langle v_\alpha,v_\beta\rangle=\delta_{\alpha\beta}\qquad\forall 1\leq\alpha,\beta\leq r. \tag{2.33}$$

Let $\{v_{r+1},\cdots,v_n\}$ be an orthonormal basis of $P_0^\perp=P^\perp\cap Q_0^\perp$, then $\{v_1,\cdots,v_n\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $P^\perp$. Applying (2.32) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon_\alpha&=\mathcal{P}_0\varepsilon_\alpha=\cos\theta_\alpha(\mathcal{P}_0u_\alpha)-\sin\theta_\alpha(\mathcal{P}_0v_\alpha)\\&=\cos^2\theta_\alpha\varepsilon_\alpha-\sin\theta_\alpha(\mathcal{P}_0v_\alpha),\end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$\mathcal{P}_0v_\alpha=-\sin\theta_\alpha\varepsilon_\alpha\qquad\forall 1\leq\alpha\leq r. \tag{2.34}$$

On the other hand, $v_i\in Q_0^\perp$ implies $\mathcal{P}_0v_i=0$ for each $r+1\leq i\leq n$. Hence

$$\mathcal{P}_0v_i=-\sin\theta_i\varepsilon_i\qquad\forall 1\leq i\leq n. \tag{2.35}$$

□

Let M be an n-dimensional submanifold in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ and Q_0 be an fixed m-dimensional subspace in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$. Denote by TM and NM the tangent bundle and the normal bundle along M, respectively. Let θ be a $[0,\pi/2]$-valued smooth function on M, if $\theta(p)\in\mathrm{Arg}(N_pM,Q_0)$ ($\theta(p)\in\mathrm{Arg}(T_pM,Q_0^\perp)$), we say θ is a *normal (tangent) Jordan angle function* of M relative to Q_0. Denote by Arg^N (Arg^T) the set consisting of all the normal (tangent) Jordan angle functions of M relative to Q_0. If θ is a smooth function on M that is nonzero everywhere, then Lemma 2.1 implies $\theta\in\mathrm{Arg}^N$ if and only if $\theta\in\mathrm{Arg}^T$.

Denote

$$\begin{aligned} N_\theta M &:= \{\nu \in N_p M : p \in M, \nu \text{ is an angle direction associated to } \theta(p)\}, \\ T_\theta M &:= \{v \in T_p M : p \in M, v \text{ is an angle direction associated to } \theta(p)\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.36}$$

Let $\mathcal{P}_0$ and $\mathcal{P}_0^\perp$ be orthogonal projections onto Q_0 and $Q_0^\perp$, $(\cdot)^T$ and $(\cdot)^N$ denote orthogonal projections onto T_pM and N_pM, respectively. Then $\nu \in N_\theta M \cap N_p M$ if and only if

$$(\mathcal{P}_0 \nu)^N = \cos^2\theta(p)\nu \tag{2.37}$$

and similarly $u \in T_\theta M \cap T_p M$ if and only if

$$(\mathcal{P}_0^\perp u)^T = \cos^2\theta(p) u. \tag{2.38}$$

Let $m_\theta^N(p) := \dim(N_\theta M \cap N_p M)$, $m_\theta^T(p) := \dim(T_\theta M \cap T_p M)$ for every $p \in M$, then m_θ^N and m_θ^T are both $\mathbb{Z}^+$-valued functions on M.

Lemma 2.3. *Let θ be a normal (tangent) Jordan angle function of M relative to Q_0. If m_θ^N (m_θ^T) is a constant function on M, then $N_\theta M$ ($T_\theta M$) is a smooth subbundle of NM (TM). In this case, $N_\theta M$ ($T_\theta M$) is said to be a* ***normal (tangent) angle space distribution*** *associated to θ.*

Proof. We only give the proof for the tangential case, because it is similar for the normal case.

For any $p_0 \in M$, let U be a coordinate chart around p_0 and $\{e_1, \cdots, e_n\}$ be a orthonormal tangent frame field on U. Denote

$$A_{ij}(p) = \langle \mathcal{P}_0^\perp e_i, e_j\rangle \qquad \forall 1 \le i, j \le n, \tag{2.39}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} A_{ij}(p) &= \langle \mathcal{P}_0^\perp e_i, e_j\rangle = \langle \mathcal{P}_0^\perp e_i, \mathcal{P}_0^\perp e_j\rangle \\ &= \langle \mathcal{P}_0^\perp e_j, \mathcal{P}_0^\perp e_i\rangle = \langle \mathcal{P}_0^\perp e_j, e_i\rangle = A_{ji}(p) \end{aligned}$$

and hence $p \mapsto A(p)$ is a smooth mapping from U into S_n, the set of all $n \times n$ real symmetric matrices. For any $u = \sum_i u_i e_i \in TU$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{P}_0^\perp u)^T &= \sum_j \langle \mathcal{P}_0^\perp u, e_j\rangle e_j = \sum_{i,j} \langle u_i(\mathcal{P}_0^\perp e_i), e_j\rangle e_j \\ &= \sum_{i,j} u_i A_{ij} e_j. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $(\mathcal{P}_0^\perp u)^T = \cos^2\theta(p) u$ if and only if $A(p)\xi = \cos^2\theta(p)\xi$, with $\xi := (u_1 \ \cdots \ u_n)^T$. Furthermore, $\theta \in \mathrm{Arg}^T$ if and only if $\lambda(p) := \cos^2\theta(p)$ is a characteristic root of $A(p)$ for every $p \in U$, and the multiplicity of $\lambda(p)$ equals $m_\theta^T(p)$. If $m_\theta^T \equiv k$, the main theorem in [16] enable us to find smooth mappings $\xi_1, \cdots, \xi_k : V \to \mathbb{R}^n$, where V is a neighborhood of p_0, such that for every $p \in V$, $A(p)\xi_i = \lambda(p)\xi_i$ holds for $1 \le i \le k$ and $\{\xi_1(p), \cdots, \xi_m(p)\}$ is linear independent. Denote $\xi_i = (u_{i1}, \cdots, u_{in})^T$ and let

$$X_i = \sum_j u_{ij} e_j,$$

then $X_1, \cdots, X_m$ are smooth tangent vector fields on V and $T_\theta M \cap T_p M$ is spanned by $X_1(p), \cdots, X_m(p)$ for any $p \in V$. Finally the arbitrariness of p_0 ensures that $T_\theta M$ is a smooth distribution on M.

□

3. Subharmonic functions

Let $\bar{M}^{n+m}$ be a Riemannian manifold, and $M^n \to \bar{M}^{n+m}$ be an isometric immersion. The second fundamental form B is a pointwise symmetric bilinear form on T_pM ($p \in M$) with values in N_pM defined by

$$B_{XY} = (\overline{\nabla}_X Y)^N$$

with $\overline{\nabla}$ the Levi-Civita connection on $\bar{M}$. The induced connections on TM and NM are defined by

$$\nabla_X Y = (\overline{\nabla}_X Y)^T, \qquad \nabla_X \nu = (\overline{\nabla}_X \nu)^N.$$

Here X, Y are smooth sections of TM and ν denotes a smooth sections of NM. The second fundamental form, the curvature tensor of the submanifold, the curvature tensor of the normal bundle and the curvature tensor of the ambient manifold satisfy the Gauss equations, the Codazzi equations and the Ricci equations (see [20] for details).

The trace of the second fundamental form gives a normal vector field H on M, which is called the mean curvature vector field. If $\nabla H \equiv 0$, then we say M has parallel mean curvature. Moreover if $H \equiv 0$, M is called a minimal submanifold in $\bar{M}$.

Now we consider an n-dimensional oriented submanifold M in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$. Let $\{e_1, \cdots, e_n\}$ be a local orthonormal tangent frame field, $\{\nu_1, \cdots, \nu_m\}$ be a local orthonormal normal frame field on M, and

$$h_{\alpha,ij} := \langle B_{e_i e_j}, \nu_\alpha \rangle$$

be the coefficients of the second fundamental form B. We shall use the summation convention and agree on the ranges of indices

$$1 \le i, j, k, l \le n, \qquad 1 \le \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \le m.$$

The normal Gauss map $\gamma : M \to \mathbf{G}_{m,n}$ is defined by

$$\gamma(p) = N_p M \in \mathbf{G}_{m,n}$$

via parallel translation in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ for every $p \in M$. Let Q_0 be a fixed point in $\mathbf{G}_{m,n}$ and define

$$w := w(\cdot, Q_0) \circ \gamma = \langle \nu_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \nu_m, Q_0 \rangle. \tag{3.1}$$

By the Codazzi equations, it is not hard to get basic formulas for the function w as follows.

Proposition 3.1. *([6][21]) Let M be a submanifold in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$, then*

$$\nabla_{e_i} w = -h_{\alpha,ij}\langle \nu_{\alpha j}, Q_0\rangle \tag{3.2}$$

with

$$\nu_{\alpha j} := \nu_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_j \wedge \cdots \wedge \nu_m \tag{3.3}$$

that is obtained by replacing ν_α by e_j in $\nu_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \nu_m$. Moreover if M has parallel mean curvature, then

$$\Delta w = -|B|^2 w + \sum_i \sum_{\alpha\neq\beta, j\neq k} h_{\alpha,ij} h_{\beta,ik} \langle \nu_{\alpha j,\beta k}, Q_0\rangle. \tag{3.4}$$

with

$$\nu_{\alpha j,\beta k} := \nu_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_j \wedge \cdots \wedge e_k \wedge \cdots \wedge \nu_m \tag{3.5}$$

that is obtained by replacing ν_α by e_j and ν_β by e_k in $\nu_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \nu_m$, respectively.

Let $p \in M$ satisfying $w(p) = w(N_pM, Q_0) > 0$. Denote by

$$\pi/2 > \theta_1 \geq \cdots \geq \theta_r > \theta_{r+1} = \cdots = \theta_m = 0$$

the Jordan angles between N_pM and Q_0. By Lemma 2.2, one can find an oriented orthonormal basis $\{\varepsilon_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_m\}$ of Q_0, an oriented orthonormal basis $\{\nu_1, \cdots, \nu_m\}$ of N_pM and an orthonormal basis $\{e_1, \cdots, e_n\}$ of T_pM, such that $\mathcal{P}_0\nu_\alpha = \cos\theta_\alpha \varepsilon_\alpha$ and $\mathcal{P}_0 e_i = -\sin\theta_i \varepsilon_i$. Especially

$$e_\alpha = \Phi_{\theta_\alpha}(\nu_\alpha) \qquad \forall 1 \leq \alpha \leq r. \tag{3.6}$$

Putting

$$\lambda_\alpha := \tan\theta_\alpha, \tag{3.7}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \nu_{\alpha j}, Q_0\rangle &= \langle \nu_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_j \wedge \cdots \wedge \nu_m, \varepsilon_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \varepsilon_m\rangle \\
&= \langle \mathcal{P}_0\nu_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathcal{P}_0 e_j \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathcal{P}_0\nu_m, \varepsilon_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \varepsilon_m\rangle \\
&= \langle \cos\theta_1\varepsilon_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge (-\sin\theta_j\varepsilon_j) \wedge \cdots \wedge \cos\theta_m\varepsilon_m, \varepsilon_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \varepsilon_m\rangle \\
&= -\delta_{\alpha j}\tan\theta_\alpha \Big(\prod_\gamma \cos\theta_\gamma\Big) \\
&= -\delta_{\alpha j}\lambda_\alpha w(p)
\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle \nu_{\alpha j,\beta k}, Q_0\rangle \\
=&\langle \nu_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_j \wedge \cdots \wedge e_k \wedge \cdots \wedge \nu_m, \varepsilon_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \varepsilon_m\rangle \\
=&\langle \mathcal{P}_0\nu_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathcal{P}_0 e_j \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathcal{P}_0 e_k \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathcal{P}_0\nu_m, \varepsilon_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \varepsilon_m\rangle \\
=&\langle \cos\theta_1\varepsilon_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge (-\sin\theta_j\varepsilon_j) \wedge \cdots \wedge (-\sin\theta_k\varepsilon_k) \wedge \cdots \wedge \cos\theta_m\varepsilon_m, \varepsilon_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \varepsilon_m\rangle \\
=&(\delta_{\alpha j}\delta_{\beta k} - \delta_{\alpha k}\delta_{\beta j})\tan\theta_\alpha \tan\theta_\beta \Big(\prod_\gamma \cos\theta_\gamma\Big) \\
=&(\delta_{\alpha j}\delta_{\beta k} - \delta_{\alpha k}\delta_{\beta j})\lambda_\alpha\lambda_\beta w(p).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

Substituting (3.8) and (3.9) into (3.2) and (3.4), respectively, we obtain

$$w^{-1}\nabla_{e_i} w = \sum_{\alpha} \lambda_\alpha h_{\alpha,i\alpha}, \tag{3.10}$$

$$w^{-1}\Delta w = -|B|^2 + \sum_i \sum_{\alpha\neq\beta} \lambda_\alpha\lambda_\beta (h_{\alpha,i\alpha}h_{\beta,i\beta} - h_{\alpha,i\beta}h_{\beta,i\alpha}). \tag{3.11}$$

Let

$$v := w^{-1}, \tag{3.12}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} v^{-1}\Delta v &= w\big(-w^{-2}\Delta w + 2w^{-3}|\nabla w|^2\big) \\ &= |B|^2 + 2\sum_{i,\alpha} \lambda_\alpha^2 h_{\alpha,i\alpha}^2 + \sum_i \sum_{\alpha\neq\beta} \lambda_\alpha\lambda_\beta (h_{\alpha,i\alpha}h_{\beta,i\beta} + h_{\alpha,i\beta}h_{\beta,i\alpha}) \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Observing that $\lambda_\alpha\lambda_\beta = 0$ whenever $\alpha > r$ or $\beta > r$, we group the terms of (3.14) according to the different types of the indices of the coefficients of the second fundamental form as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} v^{-1}\Delta v =& \sum_\alpha \sum_{i,j>r} h_{\alpha,ij}^2 + \sum_{i>r} I_i + \sum_{i>r,1\leq\alpha<\beta\leq r} II_{i\alpha\beta} \\ &+ \sum_{1\leq\alpha<\beta<\gamma\leq r} III_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + \sum_{1\leq\alpha\leq r} IV_\alpha \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

where

$$I_i = \sum_{1\leq\alpha\leq r} (2+2\lambda_\alpha^2) h_{\alpha,i\alpha}^2 + \sum_{1\leq\alpha,\beta\leq r,\alpha\neq\beta} \lambda_\alpha\lambda_\beta h_{\alpha,i\alpha}h_{\beta,i\beta}, \tag{3.15}$$

$$II_{i\alpha\beta} = 2h_{\alpha,i\beta}^2 + 2h_{\beta,i\alpha}^2 + 2\lambda_\alpha\lambda_\beta h_{\alpha,i\beta}h_{\beta,i\alpha}, \tag{3.16}$$

$$\begin{aligned} III_{\alpha\beta\gamma} =& 2h_{\alpha,\beta\gamma}^2 + 2h_{\beta,\gamma\alpha}^2 + 2h_{\gamma,\alpha\beta}^2 \\ &+ 2\lambda_\alpha\lambda_\beta h_{\alpha,\beta\gamma}h_{\beta,\gamma\alpha} + 2\lambda_\beta\lambda_\gamma h_{\beta,\gamma\alpha}h_{\gamma,\alpha\beta} + 2\lambda_\gamma\lambda_\alpha h_{\gamma,\alpha\beta}h_{\alpha,\beta\gamma} \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} IV_\alpha =& (1+2\lambda_\alpha^2) h_{\alpha,\alpha\alpha}^2 + \sum_{1\leq\beta\leq r,\beta\neq\alpha} \big(h_{\alpha,\beta\beta}^2 + (2+2\lambda_\beta^2) h_{\beta,\alpha\beta}^2\big) \\ &+ \sum_{1\leq\beta,\gamma\leq r,\beta\neq\gamma} \lambda_\beta\lambda_\gamma h_{\beta,\alpha\beta}h_{\gamma,\alpha\gamma} + 2\sum_{1\leq\beta\leq r,\beta\neq\alpha} \lambda_\alpha\lambda_\beta h_{\alpha,\beta\beta}h_{\beta,\alpha\beta}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

Note that the first term vanishes whenever $n = r$, the second term vanishes whenever $n = r$ or $r \leq 1$ and the third term vanishes whenever $r \leq 2$.

It is easily seen that

$$I_i = \big(\sum_{1\leq\alpha\leq r} \lambda_\alpha h_{\alpha,i\alpha}\big)^2 + \sum_{1\leq\alpha\leq r} (2+\lambda_\alpha^2) h_{\alpha,i\alpha}^2 \geq 2\sum_{1\leq\alpha\leq r} h_{\alpha,i\alpha}^2. \tag{3.19}$$

Hence $I_i = 0$ if and only if $h_{\alpha,i\alpha} = 0$ for any $1 \leq \alpha \leq r$.

Lemma 3.1. *If $v(p) \le 3$, then $II_{i\alpha\beta} \ge 0$ for any $i > r$, $1 \le \alpha < \beta \le r$, and $\sum_{i>r,1\le\alpha<\beta\le r} II_{i\alpha\beta} = 0$ if and only if one of the following two cases occurs: (a) $h_{\alpha,i\beta} = h_{\beta,i\alpha} = 0$ for every i, α, β; (b) $r = 2$, $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \sqrt{2}$ and $h_{1,i2} = -h_{2,i1}$ for each i.*

Proof. In conjunction with (3.12), (2.30) and (3.7) we have

$$\begin{aligned} v^2 = w^{-2} &= \prod_\alpha \sec^2\theta_\alpha = \prod_{1\le\alpha\le r} (1+\tan^2\theta_\alpha) \\ &= \prod_{1\le\alpha\le r} (1+\lambda_\alpha^2) \ge (1+\lambda_1^2)(1+\lambda_2^2) \\ &= 1+\lambda_1^2\lambda_2^2+\lambda_1^2+\lambda_2^2 \ge 1+\lambda_1^2\lambda_2^2+2\lambda_1\lambda_2 \\ &= (1+\lambda_1\lambda_2)^2 \ge (1+\lambda_\alpha\lambda_\beta)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $v \le 3$ implies $\lambda_\alpha\lambda_\beta \le 2$, and equality holds if and only if $r = 2$ and $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \sqrt{2}$.

By (3.16),

$$II_{i\alpha\beta} = \lambda_\alpha\lambda_\beta(h_{\alpha,i\beta}+h_{\beta,i\alpha})^2 + (2-\lambda_\alpha\lambda_\beta)(h_{\alpha,i\beta}^2+h_{\beta,i\alpha}^2) \ge 0. \tag{3.20}$$

Equality holds whenever one and only one of the two cases occurs: (i) $h_{\alpha,i\beta} = h_{\beta,i\alpha} = 0$; (ii) $\lambda_\alpha\lambda_\beta = 2$ and $h_{\alpha,i\beta} = -h_{\beta,i\alpha} \ne 0$. Thereby the conclusion follows.

□

Lemma 3.2. *If $v(p) \le 3$, then $III_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \ge 0$ for any $1 \le \alpha < \beta < \gamma \le r$ and the equality holds if and only if $h_{\alpha,\beta\gamma} = h_{\beta,\gamma\alpha} = h_{\gamma,\alpha\beta} = 0$.*

Proof. Let

$$x := h_{\alpha,\beta\gamma},\ y := h_{\beta,\gamma\alpha},\ z := h_{\gamma,\alpha\beta} \tag{3.21}$$

and

$$a := \lambda_\alpha,\ b := \lambda_\beta,\ c := \lambda_\gamma. \tag{3.22}$$

Then it is sufficient to show that the quadratic form

$$III_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = 2x^2+2y^2+2z^2+2abxy+2bcyz+2cazx \tag{3.23}$$

is positive definite whenever $a \ge b \ge c > 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} (1+a^2)(1+b^2)(1+c^2) &= (1+\lambda_\alpha^2)(1+\lambda_\beta^2)(1+\lambda_\gamma^2) \\ &\le \prod_{1\le\delta\le r} (1+\lambda_\delta^2) = v(p)^2 \le 9. \end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

It is easily-seen that

$$III_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = (ax+by+cz)^2 + (2-a^2)x^2 + (2-b^2)y^2 + (2-c^2)z^2. \tag{3.25}$$

If $a^2 \leq 2$, then (3.24) implies $2 > b^2 \geq c^2 > 0$. Hence $III_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \geq 0$ and equality holds if and only if $ax + by + cz = y = z = 0$, which is equivalent to $x = y = z = 0$.

If $a^2 > 2$, again using (3.24) gives $2 > b^2 \geq c^2 > 0$. Putting $s := by + cz$, then by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} s^2 &= (by + cz)^2 \\ &= \Big(\frac{b}{\sqrt{2-b^2}}\sqrt{2-b^2}y + \frac{c}{\sqrt{2-c^2}}\sqrt{2-c^2}z\Big)^2 \\ &\leq \Big(\frac{b^2}{2-b^2} + \frac{c^2}{2-c^2}\Big)\Big[(2-b^2)y^2 + (2-c^2)z^2\Big] \end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

and equality holds if and only if $\big(\frac{b}{\sqrt{2-b^2}}, \frac{c}{\sqrt{2-c^2}}\big)$ and $(\sqrt{2-b^2}y, \sqrt{2-c^2}z)$ is linear independent, i.e.

$$\frac{2-b^2}{b}y = \frac{2-c^2}{c}z. \tag{3.27}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} III_{\alpha\beta\gamma} &= (ax+s)^2 + (2-a^2)x^2 + (2-b^2)y^2 + (2-c^2)z^2 \\ &\geq (ax+s)^2 + (2-a^2)x^2 + \Big(\frac{b^2}{2-b^2} + \frac{c^2}{2-c^2}\Big)^{-1}s^2 \\ &= 2x^2 + 2axs + \Big[1 + \Big(\frac{b^2}{2-b^2} + \frac{c^2}{2-c^2}\Big)^{-1}\Big]s^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

It is well-known that the quadratic form $\sum_{1\leq i,j\leq 2} a_{ij}u_{ij}$ is positive definite if and only if $a_{11} > 0$ and $\det(a_{ij}) > 0$. Therefore, to show that the right hand side of (3.28) is positive definite, it is sufficient to prove

$$2\Big[1 + \Big(\frac{b^2}{2-b^2} + \frac{c^2}{2-c^2}\Big)^{-1}\Big] - a^2 > 0,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{2-a^2} + \frac{1}{2-b^2} + \frac{1}{2-c^2} < 1. \tag{3.29}$$

Denoting $u := 1 + a^2, v := 1 + b^2, w := 1 + c^2$,

$$\Omega = \{(u, v, w) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : u > 3 > v \geq w > 1, uvw \leq 9\}$$

and

$$f(u, v, w) = \frac{1}{3-u} + \frac{1}{3-v} + \frac{1}{3-w} = \frac{1}{2-a^2} + \frac{1}{2-b^2} + \frac{1}{2-c^2},$$

then it suffices to show $f|_\Omega < 1$. For a sufficiently small positive constant ε, let

$$\Omega_\varepsilon = \{(u, v, w) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : u \geq 3 + \varepsilon, 3 - \varepsilon \geq v, w \geq 1 + \varepsilon, uvw \leq 9\},$$

then Ω_ε is compact and there exists $(u_0, v_0, w_0) \in \Omega_\varepsilon$, such that

$$f(u_0, v_0, w_0) = \max_{\Omega_\varepsilon} f. \tag{3.30}$$

Fix v_0, then (3.30) implies for any $(u, v_0, w) \in \Omega_\varepsilon$ such that $uw = u_0 w_0$,

$$f_{v_0}(u,w) := \frac{1}{3-u} + \frac{1}{3-v_0} + \frac{1}{3-w} \le \frac{1}{3-u_0} + \frac{1}{3-v_0} + \frac{1}{3-w_0}.$$

Differentiating both sides of $uw = u_0 w_0$ yields $\frac{du}{u} + \frac{dw}{w} = 0$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} df_{v_0} &= \frac{du}{(3-u)^2} + \frac{dw}{(3-w)^2} \\ &= \Big[-\frac{u}{(3-u)^2} + \frac{w}{(3-w)^2} \Big] \frac{dw}{w} \\ &= \frac{(w-u)(9-uw)}{(3-u)^2(3-w)^2} \frac{dw}{w} \end{aligned}$$

which means that $f_{v_0}(u,w)$ is strictly decreasing in w. Therefore $w_0 = 1+\varepsilon$. Similarly one can derive $v_0 = 1+\varepsilon$. Therefore $u_0 = 9(1+\varepsilon)^{-2}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\Omega_\varepsilon} f = f(u_0, v_0, w_0) &= \frac{1}{3-9(1+\varepsilon)^{-2}} + \frac{1}{3-(1+\varepsilon)} + \frac{1}{3-(1+\varepsilon)} \\ &< \frac{1}{3-9} + \frac{1}{3-1} + \frac{1}{3-1} = \frac{5}{6} < 1. \end{aligned}$$

Then $f|_\Omega < 1$ follows from $\Omega \subset \bigcup_\varepsilon \Omega_\varepsilon$.

Thus $III_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \ge 0$ and equality holds if and only if $x = 0$, $s = by + cz = 0$ and (3.27) holds true, which imply $x = y = z = 0$ and the conclusion follows.

□

In [11], we obtained an estimate for the fourth term as follows.

Lemma 3.3. [11] *There exists a positive constant ε_0 with the following property. If $v(p) \le 3$, then*

$$IV_\alpha \ge \varepsilon_0 \big(h^2_{\alpha,\alpha\alpha} + \sum_{1 \le \beta \le r, \beta \ne \alpha} (h^2_{\alpha,\beta\beta} + 2h^2_{\beta,\alpha\beta}) \big).$$

In conjunction with (3.14), (3.15), Lemma 3.1-3.3, $\Delta v(p) \ge 0$ whenever $v(p) \le 3$. Moreover if $\Delta v(p) = 0$ and $|B|^2(p) > 0$, then $r = 2$, $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \sqrt{2}$, $h_{1,i2} = -h_{2,i1}$ for any $i \ge 3$ and the coeffients of B belonging to the other types all vanish. In other words, $\mathrm{Arg}(N_pM, Q_0) \subset \{0, \theta_0\}$, $\mathrm{Arg}(T_pM, Q_0^\perp) \subset \{0, \theta_0\}$ and the multiplicity of the Jordan angle θ_0 equals 2, where $\theta_0 := \arctan\sqrt{2}$. Let $N_{p,\theta_0}M$, $N_{p,0}M$ ($T_{p,\theta_0}M$, $T_{p,0}M$) denote angle spaces of N_pM (T_pM) relative to Q_0 ($Q_0^\perp$), then $N_{p,\theta_0}M = \mathrm{span}\{\nu_1, \nu_2\}$ and $T_{p,\theta_0}M = \mathrm{span}\{e_1, e_2\}$ with $e_\alpha = \Phi_{\theta_0}(\nu_\alpha)$ for each $\alpha = 1, 2$, $N_{p,0}M = \mathrm{span}\{\nu_3, \cdots, \nu_m\}$ and $T_{p,0}M = \mathrm{span}\{e_3, \cdots, e_n\}$.

Denote

$$S_{\mu\nu}(v) := \langle B_{v, \Phi_{\theta_0}(\mu)}, \nu \rangle \qquad \forall \mu, \nu \in N_{p,\theta_0}M, v \in T_{p,0}M, \tag{3.31}$$

Then $(\mu, \nu) \mapsto S_{\mu\nu}$ is a $T^*_{p,0}M$-valued bilinear form on $N_{p,\theta_0}M$, where V^* denotes the dual space of V. In other words, $S \in N^*_{p,\theta_0}M \otimes N^*_{p,\theta_0}M \otimes T^*_{p,0}M$. For any

$1 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq 2$ and $3 \leq i \leq n$,

$$S_{\nu_\alpha \nu_\beta}(e_i) = \langle B_{e_i, \Phi_\theta(\nu_\alpha)}, \nu_\beta \rangle = \langle B_{e_i e_\alpha}, \nu_\beta \rangle = h_{\beta, i\alpha},$$

which implies $S_{\nu_1\nu_1} = S_{\nu_2\nu_2} = 0$ and $S_{\nu_1\nu_2} = -S_{\nu_2\nu_1} \neq 0$, i.e. S is antisymmetric.

Moreover, observing that $h_{\alpha,ij} = 0$ whenever $j \geq 3$ or $\alpha \geq 3$, $h_{\alpha,\beta\gamma} = 0$ for any $1 \leq \alpha, \beta, \gamma \leq 2$, we can derive the following result.

Proposition 3.2. *Let M^n be a submanifold in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ with parallel mean curvature, $\gamma : M \to \mathbf{G}_{m,n}$ be the normal Gauss map and Q_0 be a fixed point in $\mathbf{G}_{m,n}$. Put $v := w^{-1}(\cdot, Q_0) \circ \gamma$, then for any $p \in M$, $v(p) \leq 3$ implies $\Delta v \geq 0$ at p. Furthermore, if $\Delta v(p) = 0$, then one and only one of following 2 cases must occur: (a) $|B|^2(p) = 0$. (b) $|B|^2(p) \neq 0$, $Arg(N_pM, Q_0) \subset \{0, \theta_0\}$ and $Arg(T_pM, Q_0^\perp) \subset \{0, \theta_0\}$ with $\theta_0 := \arctan\sqrt{2}$, and the multiplicity of θ_0 is 2; let $N_{p,\theta_0}M, N_{p,0}M, T_{p,\theta_0}M, T_{p,0}M$ be angle spaces and Φ_{θ_0} denote the anti-involutive automorphism associated to θ_0, then there exists a nonzero $T^*_{p,0}M$-valued antisymmetric bilinear form S on $N_{p,\theta_0}M$, such that*

$$B = \sum_{1 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq 2} (S_{\nu_\alpha \nu_\beta} \odot \omega_\alpha) \otimes \nu_\beta, \tag{3.32}$$

where $\{\nu_1, \nu_2\}$ is an arbitrary orthonormal basis of $N_{p,\theta_0}M$, $\omega_\alpha(v) := \langle v, \Phi_{\theta_0}(\nu_\alpha) \rangle$ for every $v \in T_pM$ and $\omega \odot \sigma := \omega \otimes \sigma + \sigma \otimes \omega$.

Remark. Let V be an n-dimensional real linear space equipped with an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. A linear subspace $\mathcal{Q} \subset S^2(V^*)$ of the quadratic functions on V is said to be *austere* if the odd symmetric functions of the eigenvalues of any element of $\mathcal{Q}$ with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ are all zero, i.e. the nonzero eigenvalues occur in pairs of opposite signs. Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be an austere subspace of $S^2(V^*)$, if there is a nonzero vector $v_0 \in V$, such that $\varphi(v_0, v_0) = 0$ and $\varphi(v, w) = 0$ for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $v, w \in v_0^\perp$, and $\dim \mathcal{Q} \geq 2$, then we say $\mathcal{Q}$ is *simple* (see [4]). Let M^n be a submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$, then for any $p \in M$ and $\nu \in N_pM$, $B_p^\nu : (v, w) \mapsto \langle B_{v,w}, \nu \rangle$ is a quadratic function on T_pM and hence $\mathcal{B}_p := \{B_p^\nu : \nu \in N_pM\}$ is a linear subspace of $S^2(T_p^*M)$. If $\mathcal{B}_p$ is (simple) austere for every $p \in M$, then M is said to be a (*simple*) *austere submanifold*. The concept of austere submanifolds was introduced by Harvey-Lawson [8] in connection with their foundational work on calibrations. Assume M to be a submanifold with parallel mean curvature. Let $p \in M$, if $v(p) \leq 3$, $\Delta v(p) = 0$ and $|B|^2(p) \neq 0$, then $\mathrm{Arg}(N_pM, Q_0) \subset \{0, \theta_0\}$ with $\theta_0 := \arctan\sqrt{2}$ and the multiplicity of θ_0 is 2. Now we choose $v_0 \in T_{p,0}M$, such that $\langle v_0, v \rangle = S_{\nu_1\nu_2}(v)$ for any $v \in T_{p,0}M$, then (3.32) implies $\langle B_{v_0 v_0}, \nu \rangle = 0$ and $\langle B_{vw}, \nu \rangle = 0$ for any $v, w \in v_0^\perp$, i.e. $\mathcal{B}_p$ is a simple austere subspace of $S^2(T^*M)$. Moreover, if $v \leq 3$ and $\Delta v \equiv 0$ on M, then M is a simple austere submanifold, which is congruent to an open subset of a *generalized helicoids*, due to Bryant's structure theorem for simple austere submanifolds (see [4]).

4. Bernstein theorems

We will primarily study a submanifold M^{n-1} in S^{n+m-1}, the standard unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$. The cone CM over M is the image of the map $M\times[0,\infty)\to\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ defined by $(\mathbf{x},t)\mapsto t\mathbf{x}$, namely

$$CM=\{t\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^{n+m}: t\in[0,\infty),\mathbf{x}\in M\}. \tag{4.1}$$

Obviously CM has a singularity $t=0$ unless M is a subsphere. To avoid the singularity we consider the truncated cone CM_ε defined by

$$CM_\varepsilon=\{t\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^{n+m}: t\in(\varepsilon,\infty),\mathbf{x}\in M\} \tag{4.2}$$

with $\varepsilon>0$.

M and CM_ε share similar geometric properties. At First, the comparison of the second fundamental form B of M and B^c of CM_ε immediately yields the following result.

Proposition 4.1. *([19] p.64) If CM_ε has parallel mean curvature in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$, then M is a minimal submanifold in S^{n+m-1}. Conversely, if M is a minimal submanifold in S^{n+m-1}, then CM_ε is a minimal submanifold in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$.*

There is a natural map from $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}/\{0\}$ to S^{n+m-1} by

$$\psi(\mathbf{x})=\frac{\mathbf{x}}{|\mathbf{x}|}. \tag{4.3}$$

Hence for any map F_1 from M to an arbitrary Riemannian manifold, the map

$$F:=F_1\circ\psi \tag{4.4}$$

on CM_ε is called a *cone-like map* (see [19] p.66). A direct calculation shows that F is a harmonic map if and only if F_1 is harmonic ([19] p.67). Especially, when F_1 is a function, F is a harmonic (subharmonic, superharmonic) function if and only if F_1 is harmonic (subharmonic, superharmonic).

For any $p\in M$, $N_pM\subset T_pS^{n+m-1}$ can be viewed as an m-dimensional affine subspace in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$. Via parallel translation in the Euclidean space, one can define the normal Gauss map $\gamma: M\to\mathbf{G}_{m,n}$

$$p\mapsto N_pM. \tag{4.5}$$

The canonical normal Gauss map on $CM_\varepsilon\subset\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ is defined by

$$\gamma^c: p\in CM_\varepsilon\mapsto N_p(CM_\varepsilon)\in\mathbf{G}_{n,m}. \tag{4.6}$$

It is easily-seen that γ^c is a cone-like map; more precisely,

$$\gamma^c=\gamma\circ\psi. \tag{4.7}$$

Therefore, the Gauss image of CM_ε coincides with the Gauss image of M. Applying Proposition 3.2, we can derive the following spherical Bernstein theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *Let M^{n-1} be a compact, oriented minimal submanifold in S^{n+m-1}. If there is a fixed oriented m-plane Q_0, such that*

$$\langle N, Q_0\rangle \geq 1/3 \tag{4.8}$$

for all normal m-planes N of M, then M is a totally geodesic subsphere of S^{n+m-1}.

Proof. Let CM_ε be the truncated cone generated by M, then by Proposition 4.1, CM_ε is an n-dimensional minimal submanifold in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$. Denote by γ^c the normal Gauss map of M, and

$$v := w^{-1}(\cdot, Q_0)\circ\gamma^c. \tag{4.9}$$

Since γ^c is a cone-like map extended by the normal Gauss map $\gamma : M \to \mathbf{G}_{m,n}$, v is a cone-like function. Hence the condition (4.8) implies $v \leq 3$ everywhere on CM_ε and by applying Proposition 3.2 we know v is a subharmonic function on CM_ε. Since v is a cone-like function, $v|_M$ is also a subharmonic function on M. The classical maximum principle implies $v|_M$ is constant, therefore $\Delta v \equiv 0$ on CM_ε.

$$U := \{p \in CM_\varepsilon : |B|^2(p) > 0\} \tag{4.10}$$

is an open subset of CM_ε. It suffices to show $U = \emptyset$.

We prove it by a reductio ad absurdum. Assume $U \neq \emptyset$. Let θ be a normal (tangent) Jordan angle function on U, then Proposition 3.2 implies $\theta(p) = \theta_0$ or 0 for any $p \in U$, where $\theta_0 := \arctan\sqrt{2}$. The continuity of θ forces $\theta \equiv \theta_0$ or 0. Moreover, since $m^N_{\theta_0} = m^T_{\theta_0} \equiv 2$, Lemma 2.3 implies $N_{\theta_0}U$, N_0U are smooth subbundles of NU, and $T_{\theta_0}U$, T_0U are smooth subbundles of TU. It is worthy to note that, if $m = 2$ ($n = 2$), $\nu \in N_0U$ ($u \in T_0U$) if and only if $\nu = 0$ ($u = 0$). Again applying Proposition 3.2, the normal bundle and the tangent bundle have the following decomposition

$$NU = N_{\theta_0}U \oplus N_0U,$$
$$TU = T_{\theta_0}U \oplus T_0U$$

and there exists $S \in \Gamma\big(\Lambda^2(N^*_{\theta_0}U)\otimes T^*_0U\big)$, which is nonzero everywhere on U, such that for any $p_0 \in U$,

$$B = \sum_{1\leq\alpha,\beta\leq 2}(S_{\nu_\alpha\nu_\beta}\odot\omega_\alpha)\otimes\nu_\beta \tag{4.11}$$

holds on a neighborhood of p_0, where $\{\nu_1, \nu_2\}$ is a local orthonormal frame field of $N_{\theta_0}U$ and $\omega_\alpha(v) := \langle v, \Phi_{\theta_0}(\nu_\alpha)\rangle$. Now we put $e_\alpha(p) := \Phi_{\theta_0}\big(\nu_\alpha(p)\big)$ for every p and each $\alpha = 1, 2$, then $\{e_1, e_2\}$ is a local orthonormal frame field of $T_{\theta_0}U$. Since S is nonzero everywhere, there are a unit vector field e_n of T_0U, and a positive function h, such that

$$S_{\nu_1\nu_2}(v) = h\langle v, e_n\rangle \qquad \forall v \in T_0U. \tag{4.12}$$

Now we choose $e_3, \cdots, e_{n-1}$ ($\nu_3, \cdots, \nu_m$) to be unit vector fields of T_0U (N_0U), such that $\{e_1, \cdots, e_n\}$ ($\{\nu_1, \cdots, \nu_m\}$) is a local orthonormal tangent (normal) frame field around p_0. Then (4.11) and (4.12) shows $B_{e_ie_j} = 0$ for any $1 \leq i, j \leq n-1$, $B_{e_ne_i} = 0$ for every $i \geq 3$, $B_{e_ne_1} = h\nu_2$ and $B_{e_ne_2} = -h\nu_1$.

Noting that $e_n \in Q_0^\perp$ everywhere, we have

$$\overline{\nabla}_{e_i} e_n \in Q_0^\perp \qquad \forall 1 \le i \le n \tag{4.13}$$

with $\overline{\nabla}$ the Levi-Civita connection on $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$.

Denote

$$\Gamma_{ij}^n := \langle \nabla_{e_i} e_j, e_n \rangle \qquad \forall 1 \le i, j \le n-1. \tag{4.14}$$

Differentiating both sides of $B_{e_i e_j} \equiv 0$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \nabla_{e_k} B_{e_i e_j} &= (\nabla_{e_k} B)_{e_i e_j} + B_{\nabla_{e_k} e_i, e_j} + B_{e_i, \nabla_{e_k} e_j} \\ &= (\nabla_{e_k} B)_{e_i e_j} + \Gamma_{ki}^n B_{e_n e_j} + \Gamma_{kj}^n B_{e_i e_n} \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

Interchanging the position of i and k in the above formula yields

$$(\nabla_{e_i} B)_{e_k e_j} + \Gamma_{ik}^n B_{e_n e_j} + \Gamma_{ij}^n B_{e_k e_n} = 0. \tag{4.16}$$

The well-known Codazzi equations tell us $(\nabla_{e_k} B)_{e_i e_j} = (\nabla_{e_i} B)_{e_k e_j}$, then combining (4.15) and (4.16) gives

$$\Gamma_{ki}^n B_{e_n e_j} + \Gamma_{kj}^n B_{e_i e_n} - \Gamma_{ik}^n B_{e_n e_j} - \Gamma_{ij}^n B_{e_k e_n} = 0 \tag{4.17}$$

holds for any $1 \le i, j, k \le n-1$. For any $3 \le i, j \le n-1$, choosing $k = 1$ in (4.17) implies $0 = -\Gamma_{ij}^n B_{e_1 e_n} = -h\Gamma_{ij}^n \nu_2$, hence $\Gamma_{ij}^n = 0$. For any $3 \le i \le n-1$, taking $j = 1, k = 2$ in (4.17) gives

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \Gamma_{2i}^n B_{e_n e_1} - \Gamma_{i2}^n B_{e_n e_1} - \Gamma_{i1}^n B_{e_2 e_n} \\ &= h(\Gamma_{2i}^n - \Gamma_{i2}^n)\nu_2 + h\Gamma_{i1}^n \nu_1 \end{aligned}$$

and hence $\Gamma_{2i}^n - \Gamma_{i2}^n = \Gamma_{i1}^n = 0$. Similarly, choosing $j = 2, k = 1$ yields $\Gamma_{1i}^n - \Gamma_{i1}^n = \Gamma_{i2}^n = 0$. Therefore $\Gamma_{1i}^n = \Gamma_{2i}^n = \Gamma_{i1}^n = \Gamma_{i2}^n = 0$. Now we put $i = j = 1$, $k = 2$, then (4.17) tells us

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \Gamma_{21}^n B_{e_n e_1} + \Gamma_{21}^n B_{e_1 e_n} - \Gamma_{12}^n B_{e_n e_1} - \Gamma_{11}^n B_{e_2 e_n} \\ &= h(2\Gamma_{21}^n - \Gamma_{12}^n)\nu_2 + h\Gamma_{11}^n \nu_1 \end{aligned}$$

and hence $2\Gamma_{21}^n - \Gamma_{12}^n = \Gamma_{11}^n = 0$. Similarly, putting $i = j = 2$ and $k = 1$ in (4.17) yields $2\Gamma_{12}^n - \Gamma_{21}^n = \Gamma_{22}^n = 0$. Therefore $\Gamma_{11}^n = \Gamma_{12}^n = \Gamma_{21}^n = \Gamma_{22}^n = 0$. In summary

$$\langle \nabla_{e_i} e_j, e_n \rangle = \Gamma_{ij}^n = 0 \qquad \forall 1 \le i, j \le n-1. \tag{4.18}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\nabla}_{e_1} e_n &= \sum_{1 \le j \le n-1} \langle \nabla_{e_1} e_n, e_j \rangle e_j + \langle \nabla_{e_1} e_n, e_n \rangle + B_{e_1 e_n} \\ &= -\sum_{1 \le j \le n-1} \langle \nabla_{e_1} e_j, e_n \rangle e_j + B_{e_1 e_n} \\ &= h\nu_2 \end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

and then by (4.13), ν_2 is orthogonal to Q_0, i.e. $\mathcal{P}_0 \nu_2 = 0$. But on the other hand, $\nu_2 \in N_{\theta_0} U$ implies $|\mathcal{P}_0 \nu_2| = \cos\theta_0$, which is a contradiction.

Therefore $U = \emptyset$ and CM_ε is totally geodesic in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$. Hence M has to be a totally geodesic subsphere.

□

With the results of geometric measure theory, we can also prove a Euclidean Bernstein type theorem.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $f := (f^1, \cdots, f^m)$ be a smooth $\mathbb{R}^m$-valued function defined everywhere on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose its graph $M :=$ graph $f = \{(x, f(x)) : x \in \mathbb{R}^m\}$ is a minimal submanifold in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$, and*

$$\Delta_f := \Big[\det \Big(\delta_{ij} + \sum_\alpha \frac{\partial f^\alpha}{\partial x^i} \frac{\partial f^\alpha}{\partial x^j} \Big) \Big]^{\frac{1}{2}} \le 3, \tag{4.20}$$

then $f^1, \cdots, f^m$ has to be affine linear, representing an affine n-plane in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$.

Proof. As shown in [11], the condition (4.20) says

$$v := w^{-1}(\cdot, Q_0) \circ \gamma \le 3.$$

Here γ denotes the normal Gauss map of M into $\mathbf{G}_{m,n}$, and $Q_0 := \varepsilon_{n+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \varepsilon_{n+m}$, where $\varepsilon_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_{n+m}$ denotes the Cartesian coordinate vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$. In other words, the Gauss image of M is contained in a closed region

$$\overline{\mathbb{V}} := \{P \in \mathbf{G}_{m,n} : w(P, Q_0) \ge 1/3\}.$$

Now we consider the tangent cone of M at ∞, which is the limit of a one-parameter family of minimal submanifolds in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$; each one is obtained by a contracting procedure. More precisely, let

$$f_t = \frac{1}{t} f(tx), \qquad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}^+, \tag{4.21}$$

then it is easy to check that f_t satisfies the minimal surface equations and hence $\{M_t =$ graph $f_t : t \in \mathbb{R}^+\}$ defines a family of minimal submanifolds in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$. Based on (4.20), one can proceed as in [6] §5 to show that $\{f_t : t \in \mathbb{R}^+\}$ is an equicontinuous family on any compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Thus the Arzela-Ascoli Theorem implies that there exists a subsequence $\{f_{t_i} : i \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ such that $\lim_{i\to\infty} t_i = +\infty$ and $\lim_{i\to\infty} f_{t_i} = h$, which is a Lipschitz function. One can prove that h is a weak solution to the minimal surface equations and its graph $C(M, \infty) := \{(x, h(x)) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ is a cone (see [13]), which is called the tangent cone of M at ∞. In the framework of geometric measure theory, we can prove that $C(M, \infty)$ is regular except at 0, as in [6]. Hence the intersection of $C(M, \infty)$ and the unit sphere gives an $(n-1)$-dimensional embedded minimal submanifold in S^{n+m-1}, which is denoted by M'. The image of the normal Gauss map of M' is still contained in $\overline{\mathbb{V}}$, i.e. $\langle N, Q_0 \rangle \ge 1/3$ for all normal m-planes of M' (the proof is the same as in [20] §7.3). By Theorem 4.1, M' has to be a totally geodesic subsphere. Then Allard's regularity estimate [1] implies f is affine linear and M is an affine n-plane. □

References

1. W. Allard: On the first variation of a varifold. Ann.Math. **95** (1972), 417-491.
2. F. J. Almgren: Some interior regularity theorems for minimal surfaces and an extension of Bernstein's theorem. Ann. Math. **85** (1966), 277-292.
3. S. Bernstein: Sur un théorème de géométrie et ses applications aux éuqations aux dérivées partielles du type elliptique. Comm. de la Soc. Math. de Kharkov (2éme sér.), **15** (1915-1917), 38-45.
4. R. L. Bryant: Some remarks on the geometry of austere manifolds. Bol. Soc. Bras. Mat. **21**(1991), 133-157.
5. E. de Giorgi: Una estensione del teorema di Bernstein. Ann. Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa **19**(1965), 79-85.
6. D. Fischer-Colbrie: Some rigidity theorems for minimal submanifolds of the sphere, Acta Math. **145**(1980), 29-46.
7. W. H. Fleming: On the oriented Plateau problem. Rend. Circolo Mat. Palermo **9**(1962), 69-89.
8. R. Harvey and H. B. Lawson: Calibrated geometries, Acta Math. **148**(1982), 47-157.
9. S. Hildebrandt, J. Jost and K. Widman: Harmonic mappings and minimal submanifolds, Invent. math. **62**(1980), 269-298.
10. J. Jost and Y. L. Xin: Bernstein type theorems for higher codimension, Calc. Var. PDE **9** (1999), 277-296.
11. J. Jost, Y. L. Xin and Ling Yang: The Gauss image of entire graphs of higher codimension and Bernstein type theorems. Calc. Var. PDE **47**(2013), 711-737.
12. J. Jost, Y. L. Xin and Ling Yang: The geometry of Grassmannian manifolds and Bernstein type theorems for higher codimension. arXiv: 1109.6394.
13. H. B. Lawson: Mimimal varieties in real and complex geometry. University of Montréal, 1973.
14. H. B. Lawson and R. Osserman: Non-existence, non-uniqueness and irregularity of solutions to the minimal surface system. Acta math. **139**(1977), 1-17.
15. J. Moser: On Harnack's theorem for elliptic differential equations. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **14**(1961), 577-591.
16. K. Nomizu: Characteristic roots and vectors of a differentiable family of symmetric matrices. Linear and Multilinear Algebra **1**(1973), 159-162.
17. J. Simons: Minimal varieties in Riemannian manifolds. Ann. Math. **88** (1968), 62-105.
18. Yung-Chow Wong: Differential geometry of Grassmann manifolds, Proc. N.A.S. **57** (1967), 589-594.
19. Y. L. Xin: Geometry of harmonic maps, Birkhauser, 1996.
20. Y. L. Xin: Minimal submanifolds and related topics, World Scientic Publ. 2003.
21. Y. L. Xin: Bernstein type theorems without graphic condition, Asian J. Math. **9(1)**, (2005), 31-44.

Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, Inselstr. 22, 04103 Leipzig, Germany.

E-mail address: jost@mis.mpg.de

Institute of Mathematics, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China.

E-mail address: ylxin@fudan.edu.cn

Institute of Mathematics, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China.

E-mail address: yanglingfd@fudan.edu.cn